UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/593,171	07/21/2008	Walter Sarstedt	23719	8813	
535 KF ROSS PC	7590 12/13/201	0	EXAMINER		
5683 RIVERDA			PANI, JOHN		
SUITE 203 BO BRONX, NY 1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3736		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/13/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EMAIL@KFRPC.COM ereyes@kfrpc.com

Office Action Summary		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/593,	171	SARSTEDT, WALTER			
		Examin	er	Art Unit			
		JOHN P	ANI	3736			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica r Reply	tion appears on t	he cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	ddress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI asions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute to reply within the set or extended period for reply will eply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF 7 87 CFR 1.136(a). In no cation. ory period will apply and by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICATION EVENT, however, may a reply be tir will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from Explication to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this of the (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·		
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 02 October 20	110				
'=	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
′=	/ _						
<i>/</i> —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Applicati	on Papers						
9)🛛	The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s)	be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	0.048\	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	I-¥48)	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3736

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 1, line 5, includes the term "one-piece. Claim 5, lines 1-2 includes the terms "handle" and "symmetrical". The original disclosure does not include these terms or provide proper antecedent basis for them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1, line 5 recites "a one-piece bow-shaped bridge element". The original disclosure does not use this terminology.

 Therefore, the term is given its common meaning, which hereinafter has been assumed to be "consisting of or fashioned in a single piece or part" ("one-piece". The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Fourth edition. 2000. Houghton Mifflin

Art Unit: 3736

Company). The original disclosure does not inherently or implicitly provide support for limiting the claimed invention to a bridge element made from a single piece or part.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 6. Claim 5 includes the term "the handle". This lacks antecedent basis in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 4,976,271 to Blair ("Blair").
- 9. Blair teaches:
- 10. In reference to Claim 1

Art Unit: 3736

A blood-collecting device (see Figs. 8-15) for newborn babies and infants (note that while Blair does not explicitly disclose use with newborn babies and infants, the Blair device would be capable as it is intended for collecting blood and is sized in a suitable manner), the device comprising: a cannula (1) extending along an axis and having at one axial end a blood inlet (7) and at an opposite axial end a blood outlet (6); a bow-shaped bridge element (11) having a front end (near 112) in which the cannula is fixed and a rear end (near 96) through which the axis passes and defining with the front end a free space, the cannula outlet being exposed between the front end and the rear ends in the free space and the inlet being outside the free space (see Fig. 8); and a grip part (12) centered on the axis and fixed on the rear end of the bridge element rearward of the rear end and outside the free space (see Fig. 15).

- 11. <u>In reference to Claim 3</u>
- 12. The device defined in claim 1 (see above) wherein the bridge element is C-shaped (see Fig. 8).
- 13. in reference to Claim 5
- 14. The device defined in claim 1 (see above) wherein the handle has an outer surface substantially symmetrical to the axis (see Figs. 8-15).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 3 of Remarks, filed 10/2/2010, with respect to claims 1 and 3 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph of 6/7/2010 has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 3736

16. Applicant's arguments that "examiner has indicated the case contains allowable subject matter" and that "[t]he specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors" have been understood to be typographical errors based on a telephone message from Applicant's representative Andrew Wilford.

17. Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, and 5 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3736

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN PANI whose telephone number is (571)270-1996. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 571-272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JP/ 12/7/10

/Max Hindenburg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736 Application/Control Number: 10/593,171

Page 7

Art Unit: 3736